# PARKING STUDY

# 1981

CITY OF NORTHAMPTON, Massachusetts

JOHN MARTIN
JOHN MULLIN

TABLE OF CONTENTS


INTRODUCTION

Key Tasks . . . . . 1

Explanation of Chapters . . . . . 2

I. INVENTORY . . . . . 3

II. ANALYSIS - STANDARDS AND CHANGES . . . . . 5

How Much Parking Is Enough . . . . . 5

Survey Results . . . . . 8

Violations . . . . . 9

Signage and Maneuverability . . . . . 9

Major Generators of Current Demand-An Overview . . . . 11

The Impact of Change-An Overview . . . . . 12

III. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - INDIVIDUAL LOTS . . . . 15

Armory Street Lot . . . . . 15

Masonic Street Lot . . . . . 21

Strong Avenue Lot . . . . . 27

IV. OTHER PARKING RELATED PROBLEMS . . . . . 31

Signage . . . . . 31

The Free Lot . . . . . 31

Handicapped Spaces . . . . . 32

Bicycle Parking . . . . . 33

Main Street . . . . . 33

V. PARKING LOT MANAGEMENT . . . . . 35

Overview . . . . . 35

The Problems-Existing Facilities . . . . . 35

Problems-Future Facilities . . . . . 37

Is A Parking Authority Needed?-A Recommendation . . . . 39

Financing . . . . . 41

APPENDIX ONE: A SURVEY OF PARKING GARAGES IN FIVE CITIES . . . . . 44

APPENDIX TWO: NORTHAMTPON DOWNTOWN SURVEY . . . . . 58

APPENDIX THREE: MERCHANT'S SURVEY . . . . . 59

APPENDIX FOUR: KEY PARKING REFERENCES . . . . . 62

APPENDIX FIVE: TICKET REVENUES . . . . . 63

# INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of the Martin/Mullin Partnership concerning the status of parking in Downtown Northampton. Downtown Northampton, for the purposes of this study, is defined by the enclosed area in Map One. Particular attention was given to the parking problems and opportunities associated with Main Street, the Masonic Street Lot, the Armory Street Lot, the Strong Street Lot, the Roundhouse site and the Hotel Northampton site. The study was carried out between September 1, 1980 and March 21, 1981. The Martin/Mullin Partnership was aided throughout the study by the Northampton Office of Planning and Development and worked with the Project For Public Spaces - a consulting team under contract to the National Main Street Program. The study consisted of several key tasks:

1. To inventory the parking capacity in Downtown Northampton.

2. An analysis of the parking problems in Downtown Northampton and a determination of which problems are solvable.

3. To compare the Northampton experience with other selected cities and against existing parking standards.

4. To make recommendations concerning additional parking space in Downtown Northampton.

5. To develop alternatives for the management of parking in Downtown Northampton.

Throughout the study, the Partnership has been highly

conscious of the fiscal constraints presently imposed upon city government. Further, the Partnership has been fully aware of the changing economic climate in Washington. The findings and recommendations of the study were developed to reflect these constraints presently imposed upon city government. In fact, as the reader will note, the cost of the recommended improvements, in terms of net cash outflow, is quite small.

The Report is divided into six parts. Part One is the Inventory, which includes data on lot capacity, capacity on Main Street, the placing of meters and the timing of meters. Part Two is a general analysis of the City's downtown parking problems, compared against conventionally accepted planning standards. Further the impact of significant changes in the downtown area is discussed. Part Three is a more detailed analysis of the individual lots. Part Four reviews the problems associated with such issues as signage, the Free Lot, use of the downtown by the handicapped, and bicycle use. Part Five examines potential management strategies. Finally, in Part Six, there is a summary of the key steps that the City must take to improve downtown parking.

## I. INVENTORY

Municipal Parking for public use in the downtown is presently provided in the Masonic Lot, the Strong Lot, and the Armory Street Lot, and along several downtown streets. Considerable additional parking is provided in privately owned lots. There are 2,022 spaces collectively provided in the lots and streets, 725 of which are metered. Chart One shows the capacity of each of the lots. It also shows the number of meters in each lot and the maximum time for which meter is set. Map One shows the location of the municipal lots.

## CHART ONE

## PARKING SPACE INVENTORY AND USAGE

| | # spaces |
|---|---|
| Total | 2,022 |
| Public | 1,320 |
| Private (reserved, employee) | 702 |
| Off Street | 1,621 |
| On Street | 401 |
| 10 hr. meters | 94 |
| 2 hr. meters | 504 |
| 1 hr. meters | 122 |
| 15 min. meters | 5 |

Masonic Street Lot (47 - 2 hr. spaces)

| | |
|---|---|
| Capacity: | 47 |
| % Use: | 92* |
| Avg. Time of Visit | 87 min. |
| # Cars/Day | 258 |

Strong Avenue Lot (44 - 10 hr. spaces)

| | |
|---|---|
| Capacity: | 66 |
| % Use: | 90* |
| Avg. Time of Visit | 136 min. |
| # Cars/Day | 225 |

Armory Street Lot (29 - 10 hr. spaces)

| | |
|---|---|
| Capacity: | 129 |
| % Use: | 79* |
| Avg. Time of Visit | 127 min. |
| # Cars/Day | 620 |

* Based On A Survey Taken On Friday, November 15, 1980

## II. ANALYSIS - STANDARDS AND CHANGES

### How Much Parking Is Enough?

In city after city one regularly hears a constant plea for more parking from merchants and providers of services to enable them to cope with increasing numbers of car users and expanding demand. Often times, particularly in old New England cities and towns, there is some justification in this plea. On the other hand, increasing parking will not automatically improve business conditions. Successful downtowns are a combination of a pleasing environment, healthy entrepreneurship, a wide selection of goods and services and sufficient parking. Parking must compliment and be integrated into the other characteristics noted above, it cannot rule them. If it is overly dominating then the downtown may well lose that pleasing atmosphere that initially attracted the shopper, tired of the aridity of the out-of-town shopping malls.

It is clear that Northampton has all of the characteristics previously mentioned, except for an ample supply of parking. The key question, then, is how much is enough? Parking standards will have to be applied, but carefully, for they tell only part of the story.

For example, a previous report prepared for the City uses a standard of one square foot of off-street parking for each square foot of gross floor space which if applied would require the provision of 1325 off-street paking spaces.

The construction of this many spaces would have an enormous negative impact on the character of downtown. Meeting this standard would most likely require some building demolition and extensive blacktopping. Further, given the fact that so many people walk, ride bicycles and/or take the bus, the 1:1 ratio really has no meaning for Northampton.

Given the need to integrate parking into a healthy working downtown, the study team tailored various standards and provided a selection of high, medium and low range of variables; the middle range figures were applied in our recommendations. The rationale behind this selection was based on our assessment of the commuting patterns to the downtown, the existing supply of parking, the proposed changes to the city, the city's character and the high capacity of space utilization in the city. Chart Two explains the ratios used and determines the need. Two notes of caution need to be highlighted: 1. the downtown retail figures are based on a slightly larger area than the area defined as being "downtown" for this study, and; 2. the figures are based on present demand and do not reflect the need for additional parking that may be generated by major new development projects, such as the Hotel Northampton and the Roundhouse site.

## CHART TWO

### A. Standards By Type Of Space

| Type of Space | Spaces Required per 1000 sq.ft. | Comment |
|---|---|---|
| Retail | 4 | Includes restaurants and banks |
| Office | 2.5 | Professional, doctors, lawyers, etc. |
| Government | 1.5 | County and city use. Nature of the spaces in the grand old public buildings, and long and short term needs accounted for. |
| Hotel | 1 per room | |
| Residential | 1 per unit | |

Due to the form in which the square footage figures were available, these standards are a combination of standards from various sources. The mid point figure was taken and, where necessary, adjusted for the specific needs of Northampton.

Residential information in the form of number of units was unavailable. For the current time it is assumed that the residential automobiles are on a back to back schedule with the office and retail types, leaving the spaces free during the day and returning at night. The residential factor has been left out of the following calculations.

### B. Comparisons

| Type of Space | 1000 sq.ft. | | Standard Figure | | Approx. Need (# spaces) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Retail | 488 | X | 4 | = | 1,952 |
| Office | 193 | X | 2.5 | = | 482 |
| Government | 108 | X | 1.5 | = | 162 |
| Hotel Northampton | 70 units | X | 1 | = | 70 |
| Residential | 189 | | | | |
| Total Spaces Needed | | | | | 2,666 |
| Total Available | | | | | 2,022 |
| Shortage | | | | | 644 |

Survey Results

Two surveys were used in this study. The first (Survey One), a merchant and pedestrian survey, was designed to determine the perceived problems and assets that exist in Downtown Northampton. The second (Survey Two) was designed to determine the pattern of use over time of the Masonic Street, Armory Street and Strong Street Parking Lots.

The City of Northampton has made a remarkable comeback in recent years and according to Survey One conducted in November 1980, it is competing well with outlying malls in the area (see Appendix One for a detailed review of this survey). In fact, 55% of the merchants surveyed felt the malls had not affected their business, and 13% reported a positive benefit from the malls. Of the pedestrians surveyed,80% found the cost of goods sold in the CBD lower than the malls, and 55%-70% felt the quality, friendliness and attractiveness of the downtown, drew them to shopping there. Yet both merchants (62%) and shoppers (73%) felt that convenient parking downtown was much less available than at the malls. Clearly, though there is a desire to partronize the downtown shops, there is a strong perception by consumers that parking will be difficult to find, a perception that can be supported by factual evidence.

The second survey conducted by Martin/Mullin Partnership during three weekends (Friday and Saturday) in November

1980, during which all spaces on Main Street and the three major public lots were monitored from 9AM to 5PM, yielded the following results:

1: The Masonic and Strong Street lots were filled to greater than 90% capacity, while the Armory Street lot was filled to 80% capacity. Our analysis has shown that, despite the availability of long-term parking in these lots, approximately 43% of the parkers spent less than thirty minutes in these lots.

2: Short-term parking is more prevalent on Main Street, with 72% staying less than thirty minutes. Yet almost 25% of Main Street parkers did so illegally - by parking in front of fire hydrants, in cross-walks or by double-parking. The parkers in lots created fewer problems parking illegally at an approximate average of 9% of the number of legal spaces in public lots. In either situation an obvious safety hazard is created.

3: Violations: An important factor contributing to the parking space shortage is violation of the allowable time limit including the practice of meter feeding.*

*The colloquialism "meter feeding" describes a practice in which the owner of a vehicle will continue to insert money into the meter at regular intervals so that time on the meter does not expire. This practice is illegal in Northampton, inasmuch as the City's policy is to enforce a strict limit on the duration of parking -- even if the meter is kept from expiring.

These violations are the result of several factors. First, the City has been extremely slow in processing tickets. Second, regular users of downtown parking realize from experience that the risk of being tagged and the violation being processed is quite remote. Third, there is a shortage of meter maids and clerial assistance. With few meter maids to cover the Downtown, the probability of getting caught for illegal parking is, again, quite minimal. Fourth, the low penalty ($2.00 in most cases) does not appear to be a deterrent.

4: Signage. There is a lack of highly visible signs directing the driver to the lots. Newcomers to Northampton regularly fail to notice the small signs that exist and are often frustrated at their attempts to find a space on Main Street. Further, upon turning down the wrong side street, they are often faced with the present "permit only" and "customer only" notices which abut all of the public lots in the CBD.

5: Maneuverability. For those already familiar with the lots, the tight spaces, confused traffic flows and blind corners may deter them from attempting to find a space there.

Major Generators of Current Demand - An Overview

Major generators of traffic in downtown Northampton, each having specific problems are the Courthouse, Registry of Deeds, Fitzwilly's Restaurant and Thornes Marketplace.

The Courthouse and Registry occupy buildings in the

middle of the Downtown; each facility has some parking but it is insufficient to meet peak demands. The net result is that Court and Registry absorb parking spaces that would otherwise be occupied by shoppers.

The Fitzwilly's Restaurant is a highly successful business that generates extensive turnover. While located out of the main retail zone, at the east end of Main Street, its customers often have significant difficulty finding parking and they too, overflow into the shopper's area.

Thorne's Marketplace represents the existing major "anchor" of Downtown Northampton and is, as a consequence, a tremendous generator of pedestrians and business and of course, auto traffic. That it succeeds with virtually no parking under its control is truly amazing. Clearly, the parking needs for Thorne's Marketplace need to be particularly addressed.

The Impact of Change - An Overview

The Downtown Area of Northampton is about to undergo several significant changes. These include the revitalization of the Hotel Northampton and the reuse of the Roundhouse site for commercial and office activity. A new structure to house the Foster Farrar Company has also been proposed. All three proposals, if they are carried out fully, will have a major impact upon the character and marketing climate of the downtown. For that reason, each proposal needs to be carefully reviewed.

Foster Farrar Store: The site of the proposed new Foster-Farrar building is located in the Foster-Farrar parking lot directly behind the company's Main Street building. The proposed building is expected to consist of a two-story structure totaling 20,000 square feet. The development of this structure represents a major opportunity to improve and enhance the downtown area. First, it will provide a link between the Main Street shops and the emerging small shopping area south of Hampton Avenue. Secondly, it will help to bring a sense of order to the area behind the Main Street shops and most likely, lead to improving the rear elevations of the Main Street stores. Thirdly, it will expand the number of shoppers coming into the downtown area.

The Hotel Northampton: The revitalization of the Hotel Northampton (now underway) will involve the complete rehabilitation of guest rooms, the creation of seven new function rooms, the expansion of Wiggins Tavern and the development of a health spa. One proposed future element of the project is the construction of a 300+ car parking garage immediately north and adjacent to the hotel. The garage and hotel complex, if completed as planned, will serve as the northerly anchor for the Central Business District. Moreover, it will probably trigger additional development and/or redevelopment along King Street, making the area much more commercially successful and, as well,leading to new parking demands. Careful study should be made of the mixed land uses presently

surrounding the Hotel so that pressures for development and changing uses in the area can be anticipated and controlled. If possible, this should be undertaken in the context of an overall plan.

The Roundhouse: This area has great promise for future development (drawing no. 6). The Roundhouse structure itself is interesting and unique and the location could be an attractive one for shops, resturants and office space. A proposal, currently pending by a private developer, would commit one million dollars to renovating the Roundhouse building and constructing a 10,000 square foot addition for office and retail space.

There is also the possibility that a much needed physical connection to the Downtown Area via Pulaski Park could be achieved under a comprehensive development. To this end the City, as part of a Commerical Area Revitalization District (CARD) Proposal, has requested State assistance to develop a landscaped parking area adjacent to the Roundhouse, and to contribute to the cost of an elevated walkway from the Roundhouse to Pulaski Park. Should this proposal be approved then the key parking and pedestrian movement problems associated with this project will have been solved.

Beyond these projects, future redevelopment in the vicinity of the Railroad Stateion and south of Brewster Court would be highly desirable and could also have large impacts on the downtown.

# III. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
## INDIVIDUAL LOTS

### A. Armory Street Lot

#### Present Conditions

The Armory Street Public Parking Lot is located directly behind one of the most important retail/commercial office blocks on Main Street. This block is composed of, amongst others, Thorne's Marketplace, Foster Farrar, Woolworths, and Gare Jewelers. The lot is accessible from Pleasant Street and Hampton Avenue, and to a limited extent, from Old South Street. Metered spaces number 129 (29 of which are ten-hour, the remainder two-hour). There are no handicapped reserved spaces in this lot. Five privately owned parking areas, containing a total of 167 spaces abut the public parking areas. Some of these spaces are reserved for employees of adjacent businesses; some are for the convenience of patrons, but a substantial number are rented out on a year to year basis (88 by the Foster-Farrar Company, 5 by BranWin Pharmacy). Many of these private lots are separated from the public parking area by fencing or by a grade change.

On a Friday in November 1980, when the municipal lot was monitored, 620 cars made use of the 129 metered spaces from 9:00 AM to 5:00PM. Fifty-one cars used the 29, ten-hour, metered spaces, while 569 used the remaining 100 two-hour metered. The average time spent in two-hour spaces was 61 minutes, while 4 hours 33 minutes was the average for ten-hour spaces.

Of all the vehicles parked at two-hour meters, 45% stayed thirty minutes or less. Only 20% of the vehicles parked at ten-hour meters stayed thirty minutes or less. Of the ten-hour space parkers, 16% remained longer than two hours and only 38% of these staying for more than seven hours.

This data implies that the difference in meter timing within the Armory Lot is fairly effective in allocating and controlling the length of time that people park. Certainly the majority of long-term parkers parked at ten-hour meters while short-term parkers tended to use the two-hour meters. However, the relatively high percentage of those who stayed at ten-hour meters for fifteen minutes or less (16%) suggests that when long-term spaces are available, people do not hesitate to use them for their short-term parking needs.

Key Problems

This lot has a number of major problems which stem from an inefficient layout and the confusing separation of public and private parking areas. Circulation is poor, entries and exists are poorly signed, and the spaces are tightly arranged in both public and private lots.

Poor layout, the absence of coordinated parking spaces between public and private areas, and the total lack of landscaping in this large expanse of parking area is visually unattractive. Transformers protected by chainlink fencing, the dark passage way to Pleasant Street (Kirkland Avenue) and haphazardly-placed dumpsters give an unkempt feeling to a

heavily used area of the City. This is unfortunate, especially since the rear facades of buildings on this block have a potentially pleasing appearance. Also, this is a heavily used area of the City and one where shoppers receive the first impression of what the City has to offer.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the area be reorganized along the lines indicated on drawing no. 2 and, as much as possible reconfigured as one large lot. This could be accomplished through negotiating agreements between the City and private lot owners whereby public maintenance and other services (ie: ploughing, sweeping, lighting, meter servicing) would be provided in exchange for agreements to reconfigure the lots and for public use of the lots during certain designated times. For example, under such an agreement the City and the Foster-Farrar Company would mutually explore the potential for increasing the total amount of parking available in this important area. Assuming the removal of the Peter Pan Bus Terminal and the construction of the Foster-Farrar Building, Armory Street would be extended through to Old South Street. Under a transfer of property agreement, the Foster-Farrar Company could retain the use of their existing 88 spaces in new locations, but would transfer between 20 and 40 spaces directly behind Thorne's Marketplace for public use and public management. If it were necessary to balance the loss of these private spaces, 11 spaces in the public parking area could be allocated to

Foster-Farrar along the north side of the proposed building. In combination with the removal of the bus terminal and the redesign of existing spaces, this agreement would increase the number of parking spaces available to Foster-Farrar from its present 88 to 90. An additional advantage would be that the parking spaces available to Foster-Farrar will be closer to their proposed building.

In a similar manner, spaces in the consolidated overall parking lot could be allocated to other owners of private parking proportionate to the number of spaces now held. These private allocations would be in approximately the same areas as presently located, but the rearrangement would allow a more functional allocation of parking, and an increased number of overall parking spaces. Under the proposed arrangement on drawing 2, the increase in spaces for each party would be: City increased 4; Foster-Farrar increased 2; BranWin increased 3; WHMP increased 1; Carryouts increased 2; and the Gazette Printing increased 9. The total increase would be 21 spaces, bringing the total number of parking spaces to 318.

This proposed treatment of the area as a single unit would enable a landscaping program which would make the area attractive to the motorist, unify the lot, and make it easy to drive in, and provide relief from heat. Street trees could be planted along a major portion of the Armory Street entension and down several major aisles of parking. Other

plantings adjacent to the buildings would soften sharp angularities and screen structures of poor appearance. Judicious use of shrubs, and other low plantings would further enhance the area. Decorative pavings to define pedestrian areas would be installed along the entrances to buildings and as part of the general improvements to the alleyway. Paths are proposed to create a pedestrian network to separate pedestrians from vehicular movement. Private dumpsters should be clustered and screened to reduce their visual impact and to assist emptying. Transformers immediately outside the rear entrance of Thorne's should also be screened wooden fences to improve the appearance of the area.

Key City Activities

In order to implement the proposals noted above, the City should undertake the following tasks:

1. Develop model and specific legal agreements for land transfers, easements and other legal devices as necessary between city and private owners to facilitate overall lot planning.
2. Remove existing fencing and metal crash barriers and install new wooden barriers where indicated.
3. Extend Armory Street to Old South Street.
4. Adjust the grade difference between the Foster-Farrar lot and Municipal lot where crowned by the Armory Street Extension.
5. Reorient spaces to include
   - restriping
   - relocation and addition of meters
   - construction of timber crash barriers

6. Install pedestrian paving as necessary to achieve the recommended pedestrian/vehicular separation.
7. Construct several wide aisles for the planting of trees and shrub planting.
8. Install street lighting, lot lighting, trees, shrubs, and directional signage.
9. Provide timber screening in front of transformers.
10. Develop signage identifying ownership of private spaces and declaring availability of other spaces for public use.
11. Develop "model" designs in conjunction with the Main Street Program that show how the back side of the Main Street and Pleasant Street structures could be made more aesthetically pleasing.
12. Establish an adequately funded maintenance program to ensure the proper upkeep of the recommended physical improvements.

now the fire lane. These could be used for employee, metered or rental parking. A firelane, clearly defined, should be created behind the Main Street stores and adjacent parking spaces.

The presently disjointed New England Telephone Company properties could be unified and made more functional by relocating existing fencing. Through a land transfer agreement (sale or lease) worked out between the City of Northampton and the New England Telephone Company, the latter could gain ten additional parking spaces and the City would gain ten spaces.

A similar reorganization of the Nonotuck Savings Bank lot (with the Christian Science Church) through a land transfer agreement could increase the Bank's parking capacity by seventeen. Also, substanital areas for plantings and improved access for pedestrians from Masonic Street, with the construction of a set of stairs to the Christian Science Church, could be realized by this recommendation. A further agreement with owners of the residential/retail office to the west of the lot, could result in an increase of eleven spaces, although this would involve some excavation and the construction of a retaining wall. Sidewalk reconstruction and appropriate curb cuts along Center Street would help define the parking area and improve the appearance of the street.

The Christian Science Center lot could be replanned to provide easier and safer access and egress (in/off Masonic

Street, out/onto Center Street). The creation of a twelve foot-wide planting strip of trees and shrubs along the eastern border of the lot would give much needed privacy to the church and reading room and break-up the expanse of asphalt. No additional spaces would be created here, however.

Street trees and pedestrian pavement would be placed, where appropriate, to define walkways and parking areas. More specifically, there is need to remove the harsh and excessive number of curb cuts and to soften the unrestricted use of asphalt along Masonic and Center Streets. Uniform sidewalk materials could give a sense of continuity in the area. The driveway leading to the public lot from Main Street should have a sidewalk and possibly a pedestrian canopy. This canopy would help to direct the flow of pedestrian to-and-fro from Main Street to the parking lot and serve as protection from inclement weather.

Key City Activities

In order to make the changes noted above, the City would have to undertake the following tasks in cooperation with the owners of adjoining properties.

1. Develop the recommended land transfer access agreements with the New England Telephone Company and other private owners to facilitate overall lot planning.
2. Remove some sections of chainlink fence.
3. Create new layout, new stripping patterns and purchase and place meters in new locations.
4. Create uniform sidewalks and curbcuts where necessary.

5. Define the pedestrian areas with different pavement materials and possibly benches.
6. Plant trees and shrubs and carry out other landscaping work.
7. Move the transformer and fire hydrants.
8. Establish a strong maintenance program to care for the various improvements.
9. Install directional signage and informational signage regarding the public use of public and private lots.

## C. Strong Avenue Lot

### Present Conditions

The Strong Avenue Lot consists of 46 privately-owned and 66 city-owned parking spaces accessible by car from Strong Avenue. A metal crash barrier separates the public and private areas. Access to the private lot is controlled by a card-operated gate (inoperative at the present time). The municipal lot is L-shaped and adjoins the rear entrances of several Main Street and Pleasant Street shops. There are two alleyways connecting the lot to Pleasant Street, and one which leads back onto Strong Avenue. The alleyways are not well-marked, often poorly paved and are uninviting because they are often obstructed by dumpsters, illegally parked cars and trucks.

Twenty-two of the public spaces in the Strong Avenue lot have two-hour meters, and the remainder (44) have ten-hour meters. According to the survey, only 25% of those who used ten-hour metered spaces stayed more than two hours. Of these, 36% stayed less than fifteen minutes. Parking duration at ten-hour meters is virtually the same as at two-hour meters: 31% of those vehicles parked at two-hour meters stayed more than two hours, while 21% stayed less than 15 minutes. This data suggests that the public does not perceive a difference between the two types of meters. It would appear that people chose parking spaces based on proximity to their final destination rather than discriminating among meters

on the allowable lengths of stay. The average length of stay in the entire lot is 2 hours 19 minutes (1 hour 49 minutes in two-hour spaces, 2 hours 43 minutes in ten-hour spaces).

Problems

The layout of the Strong Avenue lot is less confusing and congested than the other lots, but could be used more efficiently than it is at present.

The metal crash barriers presently in place are unsightly. They also create an obstacle for pedestrians trying to get to and from their cars. Contributing to the lack of appeal to the area is the failure of private property owners to maintain and improve the rear areas and back entrances to the buildings. Also, the firelane to the rear of Pleasant Street is usually blocked by illegally parked cars and service vehicles.

Recommendations

It is clear that the whole area needs to be planned comprehensively as indicated on drawing no. 5. The initial step would be for the city and the private owners of parking and circulation areas to amalgamate their ownerships under some mutually advantageous agreement. The city might well contribute ploughing, sweeping and maintenance. Specifically, a more efficient use of the parking area could be attained by reorienting the parking spaces to create continuous aisles of north-south facing spaces. Meters could be painted to

differentiate ten-hour and two-hour meters. Once the fencing was removed, some form of signage or color coding would be used to delineate the private spaces from the public spaces and any restriction of their use.

For example, if an agreement is made with the owner of the private lot to allow Thursday evening and Saturday usage of his spaces, by the public, then signage to this effect would have to be posted.

In addition, the pedestrian alleyways should be repaved and specific directional signage, such as: "To Pleasant Street", could be developed. Finally, shade trees at the ends of parking aisles, and at the entrances to the lot could create a more appealing appearance for the area. This, in combination with the pedestrian paving, would given a cohesiveness to the lot, and a sense that people, as well as cars are welcome.

By connecting the City and the private lots and replanning them as one, there would be a gain of twelve spaces to the City and eleven spaces to the private owner resulting in a total increase of twenty-three spaces. In addition, with an agreement by the private lot owner to allow use of his lot on Thursday evenings and Saturdays, an extra fifty-two spaces could be made available to the public at large at these times. These changes would increase pedestrian accessibility to the rear entrances of the stores, while improving delivery service and emergency access.

Key City Activities

The following activities would have to be undertaken by the City to implement the recommendations explained above.

1. Develop model and specific legal agreements for land transfers, easements, and other legal devices as necessary between city and private owners to facilitate overall lot planning.
2. Remove the existing fencing and crash barriers.
3. Reorient spaces (including the moving of some of the existing meters to new positions).
4. Re-stripe to delineate new spaces.
5. Install low timber crash barriers to replace the existing metal crash barriers.
6. Repave pedestrian areas delineated upon drawings with suitable paving materials.
7. Plant street trees, and other landscape materials.
8. Design and place new signage.
9. Establish regular maintenance program.

## IV. OTHER PARKING RELATED PROBLEMS

### Signage

Signs directing automobiles to public parking lots are very poor in Northampton. A clear system of signs needs to be developed that helps: 1. to direct traffic to the lots; 2. to explain the length of time and cost in each parking area; 3. to show the difference bewteen public and private spaces and; 4. to point out access ways to the shopping area. In cases where the Thursday evening and Saturday public/private arrangement is made, the information must be clearly noted since misuse of these arrangements would jeoparidize a large number of spaces for public use at peak shopping hours.

It is recommended that the city planner in conjunction with a graphic designer, develop a signage scheme for the downtown. The city planner and graphic designer should seek the advice of professional designers, merchants, traffic engineers, and public officials.

### The Free Lot

The newly constructed Hampton Avenue Free Lot has recently come under scrutiny. A proposal to place meters on this lot is presently being discussed by the Police Committee. While such a move would raise increased revenue for the City, it would not improve the overall parking situation. In fact, should this lot become metered, it is highly likely that the long-term parkers who now occupy it would move to spaces on

Main Street or to ones that are closer to the shops, and therefore, reduce the supply of close-in spaces most needed by shoppers. Free peripheral lots such as the Hampton Free Lot provide the function of keeping long-term parkers away from core spaces.

It is recommended that over the short-term, the Hampton Avenue Free Lot be kept unmetered. Once the Roundhouse parking lot is developed and the needs of the Roundhouse tenants assessed, a determination can be made to see if this site could house long-term parking. Should there be space, then it should be so designated. This would then allow the Hampton Avenue Free Lot to become metered.

Handicapped Spaces

The topography of Downtown Northampton makes it extremely difficult for handicapped persons to park and maneuver. After reviewing the problem with the City's Committee on Handicapped Awareness and obtaining input from its members, recommendations for the location of handicapped parking spaces have been made.

It is recommended that the City's Handicapped Committee monitor the effectiveness of these spaces overtime. If designated handicapped spaces are not being used appropriately or are inconveniently located, then they should be made available for non-handicapped uses and new handicapped spaces designated.

Bicycle Parking

Throughout all of the lots in Downtown Northampton one regularly can observe bicycles being chained to parking meters, a custom dangerous to auto and bicycle owners alike. Further, it contributes to congestion on sidewalks and can block pedestrian movement.

It is recommended that bicycle parking areas be developed in each of the lots and at key points in the downtown. Through proper signage showing their location and the placing of equipment, these "bike parks" would greatly contribute to the solving of this problem.

Main Street

The ambience, character and form of Main Street are critical elements in the success of Downtown Northampton. For this reason, changes must be undertaken with great care.

It is the recommendation of this study team that the current "angle" parking remain as is. If the parking was changed to "parallel", it would change the psychological character of the shopping experience. In effect, the "angle" parking serves a key function in bringing the two sides of Main Street (the second widest in New England) closer together. The result is that shoppers will cross the street. With "parallel" parking, it is quite possible that cross-street movement would decrease. Also, "parallel" parking would reduce the capacity and the convenience of parking on this street.

It is also recommended that all meters along Main Street, west of King Street, be maintained at a one-half hour maximum time limit and that a considerably higher rate be charged than other metered areas. This would serve two key purposes. First, it would enhance the opportunity for the "short-term" shopper to gain quick, close access to the business that is the goal of the typical journey. Secondly, it would encourage "long-term" shoppers to use the off-street lots.

# V. PARKING LOT MANAGEMENT

## Overview

Parking lot management in Northampton at present is informal, disjointed and often ineffective. With merchants, city officials and the police department all playing leading roles, there is no discernable parking policy nor a clear administrative procedure governing day-to-day parking operations.

## The Problems - Existing Facilities

There is a significant need to create a parking management organization in the City. The present, informal system of decision-making involving the City Council, the downtown merchants, the Police Committee and the Police Department is too disjointed and fails to produce a coordinated program to meet the City's parking needs.

Currently, responsibility for the day-to-day management of public parking areas lies with the Police Department. Here, the work of administering, monitoring use, ticketing, and collecting revenue is assigned to a head administrative officer, two "meter maids", and a half-time secretary. The total budget of this office ($37,388-FY.81) is derived from parking meter revenues.

The two meter maids have several functions. First, they ticket parking meter violators. Secondly, they ticket and inform police officers of illegally parked vehicles. Thirdly, they ticket "meter feeders"- people who, despite

having a certain time limit on their space, continue to feed the meter. (Note: this is not considered an offence in most other communities) Fourthly, they issue complaints when tickets are not paid. Lastly, they notify the District Court of neglected ticket payments.

Three key problems have emerged from our investigation of the current arrangement of having the Police Department administer the program. First, staffing is insufficient to the task at hand. As a result, the City is losing thousands of dollars per year due to the slow processing of complaints. The Department has a fourteen-month backlog -- a backlog of more than six months in a student community results in a substantial "failure-to-collect" rate.[1] For last year, the City collected only 36% ($26,672) of a possible $74,100 in parking fine revenues. Given Northampton's fiscally austere budget for some years to come, this situation should not be allowed to continue.

Secondly, downtown merchants appear to have a minimum role in making policy decisions. For example, a recent proposal to place meters in the Hampton Avenue Free Parking Lot (discussed on p.32) was developed by the Police Committee with little merchant input.

Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, there is the issue of how parking revenues are to be spent. Meter revenues for 1980 were $88,400 (approximately $77.00 per meter). When combined with the $26,672 collected in fines, there is a

[1]Because the Post Office will not forward letters if six months has elapses since the addressee changed postal address.

substantial collection of $115,072 (or a possible 162,500 if all fines were collected) in gross revenue that is generated by parking. This amount is reduced by the salaries of the meter maid staff ($37,388) and the full-time salary of a secretary who actually devotes only half of her time to parking. The cost of parking lot maintenance, which averages $5,000 per year, and which presently means little more than snow removal, must also be deducted . The Police Department is currently the recipient of the remaining funds. While no one questions the need for adequately funding the Police Department, it could be equally argued that money should not be diverted from non-parking costs when there is such an obvious need to upgrade and maintain the existing lots and also to improve lot supervision. The present practice of using all surplus parking revenues to purchase police cruisers is inappropriate and needs to be corrected. In sum, there is a clear need to create a policy that will enable both police needs and parking needs to be met.

Problems - Future Facilities

If the proposed development of the Roundhouse Project and the Hotel Northampton become a reality Northampton will have to make a series of decisions that will have an impact for years to come. Each of these projects is eligible to receive financial assistance for parking purposes under the State's Commercial Area Revitalization Parking Facilities Program. The City, in each case, will be expected to "leverage"

the developments by providing parking.[1] For the Roundhouse Project, the City is hoping to build a parking lot, while the Hotel Northampton Project calls for a parking garage as an integral element.

Under the aforementioned State Parking Facility Program, the Commonwealth may agree to pay up to 70% of the construction costs associated with the building of parking facilities; the City is expected to pay for the remaining 30%. The City's share can come from CDBG funds, city revenues or bonds. It can also accept a gift of the 30% from a merchants group or an organization such as the Northampton Development Corporation. How the City's share of this money is obtained is the first critical issue.

If the City decides to participate in the State Parking Facility Program then it must gain "control" of the land to be used for parking. In the case of the Roundhouse Site (drawing no. 6) the land proposed for parking is partially in City ownership; partially under the control of the Northampton Housing Authority; the old railroad bed is owned by a utility company. For the Hotel Northampton Site, the land likely to be devoted to parking is under private ownership and will either have to be purchased or leased as part of a property sale agreement separate from that of the hotel itself.

[1]The term "leverage" in this case refers to a practice in which the government provides financial assistance, structures or services to a developer in exchange for the willingness ofa developer to invest in a particular area of the City.

Eminent domain or market sale procedures could be used, but could be quite costly. Preferable would be an arrangement whereby the Hotel developers purchased the property and sold it to the City for $1.00, or leased it at a nominal ground rent. Either arrangement would result in a far less costly project. It should also be pointed out that there will be a loss of taxable property as a result of whatever action the city takes. In sum, the City must decide what actions maximize the City's interested in terms of controlling the land. This is the second critical problem.

Is a Parking Authority Needed? - A Recommendation

Once the public parking facilities are built whether grade-level or mutli-level structures, then the City will have to decide how to maintain and operate them. There are several choices: 1: public operation under city bureau, 2: public operation through a parking authority, 3: a lease agreement between the City and a private operator. The choice represents the third crucial problem.

The problems outlined above clearly point to the conclusion that a new system of management is required. Further, given the limited funds available to the City, it is also clear that the City will want to minimize cash outlay and maximize revenues.

The possibility of developing a new parking bureau has some merit. It would mean placing a full-time secretary, the meter maids, the garage operators and a highly skilled parking manager on the City payroll. The City, under this

option, would gain all revenues and have direct control over policy and operating procedures. Given the fiscal climate, this option is not recommended.

The option of turning over the responsibility of parking operations to a private operator also has some merit. There would be no operating costs for the City, maintenance and repairs would be the responsibility of the operator and the City could gain some revenue from renting the sites. However, the City would have little control over the day-to-day operations, the citizens and merchants would have little involvement in policy and a large amount of the revenue collected would be taken out of the City as profit. For these reasons, this option was rejected.

The option of establishing a Parking Authority combines the strengths of the previous two options without their liabilities. For this reason, this option is recommended as being most appropriate for the City of Northampton. Such an Authority would operate all municipal lots in the City as well as the proposed garage. The Authority, would be, ideally, organized to be self-supporting, and should be, able to pay all operating and maintenance expenses over time. Under ideal conditions, it would also make "payback" payments to the City in lieu of taxes for the facilities under its control (the proposed garage would be a case in point). The creation of such an authority would mean putting one organization in charge of all facets of downtown parking,

would eliminate the need for more city employees and would still provide the opportunity for a potential return to the city coffers.

Under such a move, the meter maids and secretarial staff would become authority employees; their responsibilities however would remain the same.

The new Authority would be appointed by the Mayor with the consent of City Council. Representatives of the Mayor's Office, Planning Board, Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Merchants Association, and the Banking Community, should be represented on the Board of the Authority.

Financing

The parking improvements recommended in previous sections of this report were developed under the premise that the City of Northampton was not willing to make major capital outlays for parking improvements.

The key cost items associated with the existing lots involve tasks within the capability of the City public works crews. The restripping of parking spaces, removal of fencing, paving and landscaping improvements represent the major tasks. Provided that these tasks can be incorporated into the on-going work of the public works department there will be only modest cash outlays required apart from the cost of materials. However, given the present labor force cutback in the Bureau of Public Works (BPW), the likelihood of the BPW being able to undertake this work in the short-term is unlikely. Thus,

there may have to be a cash outlay on the part of the City and building owners to pay for these improvements. Should parking revenues be released for parking improvements the direct costs to the taxpayers would, indeed, be minimal.

Concerning recommendations to improve access ways to the parking lots, funds may be available through the Urban Systems Program. To become eligible for these funds, the City must apply to the Lower Pioneer Valley Regional Planning Authority. Landscaping improvements can be funded through Community Development Block Grant Funds if the City is successful in its upcoming grant application.

There will be time costs. Both the City Solicitor and the City Planner will be required to spend time developing detailed plans and negoitiating cooperative agreements between the City and private owners. There will also be substantial design costs. Some of these can be assigned "in-house" while some will require consultant services. There will have to be meetings with the owners of private lots, key officials, and public meetings; final designs will have to be developed and; legal agreements prepared.

It should also be pointed out that the City presently makes a profit from parking. If the cost of operations and maintenance is substracted from parking meter revenues and fine revenues, there is a surplus of $72,701. If the rate of fines could be improved to 75%, which appears reasonable, there could be even greater revenue. This additional money could be applied to future improvements in the existing lots

thus eliminating capital outlays to the City. An alternate arrangement would have to be made concerning the funding of police cruisers.

The major capital costs that will be incurred in improving downtown parking will be related to the development of major parking facilities to serve the Roundhouse and Northampton Hotel. Even under the best possible circumstances, the City must finance 30% of each project. However, there may be ways to minimize cash outlays by the City. For example, the City's 30% share could be paid by the developers or by the Northampton Development Corporation. Another way of raising the local share would be to create a Betterment District, with assessments paid by property owners whose businesses benefit from increased parking. This combination of approaches would be orchestrated through maximum involvement of the Mayor and the City Planner.

In sum, through creative financing, there is every reason to believe that the City could make the improvements at little direct cost to the City's taxpayers. The result of this improved parking program would in turn stimulate added business activity in the Downtown area and strengthen the local economy.

## Appendix One

## STRUCTURED PARKING FACILITIES

## AN ANSWER TO PARKING PROBLEMS IN SMALL CITIES

Throughout New England, small cities such as Northampton are becoming increasingly concerned about the physical condition and economic vitality of downtowns. A problem common to most is the lack of adequate and convenient parking. Over the last few years, more small cities have been seeking to solve their parking problems in a way which had been reserved for large cities - the construction of structured parking facilities. The growing interest in structured parking facilities for the downtown districts of small towns is the result of several factors. An expanding list of successful experiences support this trend: the rapid rise in downtown land values which makes surface parking more expensive; the availability of grants for such projects; there is also the realization that parking structures offer one of the few workable solutions to the downtown parking problem that does not involve tearing down blocks of buildings and destroying the heritage, integrity and continuity of the downtown.

The following points appear to be applicable to most small cities in general who may be comtemplating building structures:

1. The existence or development of adequate and

convenient parking is a critical part of downtown revitalization.

2. As a matter of necessity and practicality, small city parking rates must be minimal, but hopefully sufficient to cover operating expenses.

3. Grants must be sought to pay all, or the main portion of development costs.

4. Income from the facility will be sufficient to cover both operating and amortization expenses in most cases.

5. Parking facilities should be designed to accommodate a wide-range of vehicles, including vans and pick-up trucks.

6. Generally, new structural programs such as Park and Ride, Van Pool Programs and Intermodal Transportation Centers have not been successful in small cities, except in cases involving a major origin/destination point such as a college or large plant.

7. Structured Parking Facilities in small cities often become controversial. The Chief Executive Officer must play the leadership role if a successful,non-controversial program is to exist. Merchants and citizens should be involved from the outset.

8. The most likely grant-in-aid programs for funding of small city structure parking facilities are Community Development Action Grants, Urban Development Action Grants, and the new State Off-Street Parking Facility Act (70%-30% match).

The following are case studies of five small New England cities which have developed structured parking facilities as part of their respective approaches to revitalize their downtowns. The cities are Fitchburg, Holyoke, and Salem, Massachusetts; Lewiston, Maine; and Nashua, New Hampshire.

## Fitchburg, Massachusetts

### Intown Parking Center

Fitchburg is a middle class industrial city of 38,000 located in northern Worcester County. The Central Business District, although located in the geographical center of the community, is distant from the region's highway network and has limited accessibility. Suburban shopping center development did not occur until the late 1960's. Furthermore, the character of these competing shopping centers did not measure up to the quality of those found in other cities analyzed as part of this report. In any case, during the early 1970's Fitchburg's Central Business District showed the usual signs of blight and general disinvestment, vacant store fronts and empty upper floors.

In 1975, an Intown Revitalization Plan was introduced featuring a three-level, 300 car, parking garage. The garage was planned in response to a shortage of parking for both shoppers and the 3,500 people employed in the downtown area. In addition, planners saw the garage as a catalyst to stimulate private reinvestment.

The garage was completed and formally opened in March, 1978. In the 30 months since construction began on the parking garage, 25 intown buildings have been bought by new investors. Physical renovations are now visible in several locations. Thus far, the garage has succeeded in fulfilling its basic objectives of eliminating a parking shortage and

stimulating private reinvestment.

The 300 car garage cost $1.5 million including $1.2 million for construction and $300,000 for acquisition and relocation. The entire project was funded with federal grants, the construction funding provided by a Local Public Works - Round II grant. The acquisition/relocation phase was funded with Community Development Block Grant funds.

The attractive steel-framed structure is situated directly on Main Street, in the center of the retail district. The location stresses visability and accessability. The Intown Revitalization Commission as well as consultants believed that a location not directly on the Main Street would not have been suitable. The success of the parking garage to date stems from the excellent location.

PRIDE, Inc., a local, private non-profit community development corporation plays an aggressive role involving the business community in the Fitchburg revitalization process. The garage is a prime example of their efforts. To manage this, the City considered both self-operation and a lease situation with a professional garage operator, but accepted a proposal from PRIDE. PRIDE proposed leasing the garage from the City for one dollar per year plus the guaranty that PRIDE would assume the first $10,000 of any operating deficit.

A consultant study had projected a first year deficit of up to $21,000 and three years of deficit operation before it would become self-sustaining. At the end of the first year,

PRIDE turned in a profit of $2,500. Except for periodic physical inspections, the City has turned complete operation of the facility over to PRIDE. The parking rates are fifteen cents for the first hour and ten cents for each additional hour of parking. Approximately 120 spaces are reserved for monthly parkers who pay $17 per month or $45 per quarter. Intown businessmen are involved in an actively-promoted Park and Shop Stamp Validation program.

In addition to the garage, the City of Fitchburg owns five off-street parking lots within the Intown area. The two largest lots are manned by city employees, while the three smaller lots are metered. Plans are underway to combine the employee supervised lots with the garage for operating purposes.

Holyoke, Massachusetts

Suffolk Street Parking Deck

In September, 1977, the City of Holyoke opened the new Suffolk Street Parking Deck. This functional, but attractive facility is located one-half block from, and parallel, to High Street, the Downtown's major commercial street. Visibility from High Street is primarily limited to the High Street-Suffolk Street intersection. The elongated facility extends an entire city block and consists of a single deck (ground and upper level) structure with a total of 420 parking spaces. The open deck provides parking for 220 cars. At grade level, under the deck, there are 200 covered spaces. The deck is steel-framed while the floor is a poured-in-place concrete structure with post-tensioning.

Although Downtown Holyoke has become recently involved in a $5 million state-funded Heritage Park program, the decision to build the parking deck preceeded the development of a comprehensive revitalization plan, and was built to lessen an existing parking shortage. The Suffolk Street site was chosen for convenience and accessibility. In addition, the site was owned by the City which had previously utilized it as a municipal parking lot. Therefore, only about half of the 420 parking spaces represented a net addition in total parking spaces to Downtown Holyoke's parking shortage.

The deck was built for a very reasonable $900,000 and was

fully financed with Community Development Block Grant funds. The Planning Board and the Mayor were responsible for conceiving and implementing the project. At the same time, the Chamber of Commerce supported the idea of the parking structure and raised funds to undertake soil tests on the site.

Initially, it was planned to utilize parking meters to generate turnover and operating income. However, it was later decided that parking would be free. To discourage downtown employees with parking requirements from occupying the entire facility, one level has been kept closed until 9:00 am. The parking structure is under the jurisdiction of the Holyoke Department of Public Works. The major operating expense is snow removal.

Lewiston, Maine

Centerville Parking Garage

On May 1, 1981, Lewiston, a city of 41,000 opened its first parking garage containing 367 spaces. The facility is a three-story, precast concrete structure, which will cost $1.95 million, including $235,000 for site acquisition. The garage is being financed from multiple sources, including a $1.0 million grant from the U.S. Economic Development Administration (Title I Construction Facilities Program), a $500,000 Urban Development Action Grant and $500,000 from a municipal bond issue.

The parking garage is the first phase of a comprehensive Downtown Revitalization program which includes streetscape beautification and building renovation. Since commencement of construction, several downtown properties have been purchased by local businessmen. The garage is located one half block behind the principal commercial street, and therefore is not prominently visible. However, plans are being finalized to develop a direct pedestrian corridor through one of the buildings situated between the garage and Main Street.

The City Treasurer will handle the overall responsibility for the operation of the garage with maintenance provided by the Department of Public Works. Parking rates are now under study. While the project has been controversial (as is typical of any major project in a small city), it has

generated a substantial amount of merchant and citizen support. The Mayor and the Planning Department are overseeing the construction of the project.

Nashua, New Hampshire

Factory Street Parking Garage

Nashua's decision to build a parking garage was in response to a downtown parking shortage that affected both shoppers and employees of area businesses. The opportunity to build the garage materialized with the passage of the Federally sponsored Local Public Works Act in 1976. The City of Nashua was placed in the position of having to quickly prioritize public works projects that were both necessary and that could be initiated within a three month period. As a consequence, the Factory Street Parking Garage was one of three projects undertaken by the City of Nashua.

The garage site, located one block off of Main Street, was selected because of proximity to Main Street, ownership by the City and the fact that it was already being used as a public off-street parking lot.

The Factory Street Parking Garage was opened in the Fall of 1978. It contains 220 spaces on three levels. Construction is of precast concrete with poured-in-place columns. The cost of the entire project was $1.3 million.

A professional parking garage management firm was selected to operate the Factory Street Garage, under the direction of the City Treasurer's Office. All revenues are deposited in a special City account and all bills are submitted for approval and payment by the City Treasurer.

The management firm, which utilizes its own employees,

receives an annual management fee of approximately $20 per space. The balance of Nashua's off-street parking lots are metered and supervised by the Police Department and maintained by the Public Works Department.

Salem, Massachusetts

East India Square Garage

Today, Salem has one of the most successful downtown revitalization programs in New England. However, this was not always the case. Salem spent much of the latter half of the 1960's planning downtown renewal under the Federal Urban Renewal Program, the forerunner of the Community Development Block Grant Program. The original downtown renewal plan was based on a philosophy that in order to successfully compete with suburban malls, the downtown would have to be razed and rebuilt in the style and character of the competition. The City proceeded to acquire prime downtown properties, relocate tenants, bulldoze historical buildings and advertise for developers. Developers did not respond, at least not with the quality of proposals that Salem had originally envisioned. The failure of the renewal program became a major community issue which eventually resulted in the election of a new City government.

At this point, the Downtown Plan for this community of just over 40,000,shifted from demolition and new construction to preservation and restoration. Essex Street, the major commerical street, was closed to vehicular traffic and converted into a pedestrian mall. Parking for the area was partially provided by a five-story, 1025 space, parking garage; an attractive pre-case concrete structure which was built and completed in 1974. The cost of constructing the garage

was financed with a $2.3 million municipal bond which was counted toward the City's 25% matching share to a Federal Urban Renewal Grant.

A unique aspect of the garage is that parking occurs on levels two through five. The first floor area, consisting of 75,000 square feet, was leased to a private developer under a long-term lease for development of commercial space. When completed, the space will be occupied by approximately 23 stores.

The East India Square Garage, as it is called, plus seven municipal parking lots, are operated by the City of Salem through its Off Street Parking Commission. Short-term parking rates are 25 cents per hour with no charge for the first thirty minutes. The monthly parking rate is set at $12.50. Merchants participate in a "Park and Shop" validation program, books of 100 one-hour stamps are purchased by the merchants for $10.00.

Tenanting of the new commercial space on the first floor of the garage has been slow to materialize, which in turn, has resulted in lower than projected parking revenues. As of spring, 1981, with only thirteen of the twenty-three stores were occupied, parking revenues were just beginning to cover operating expenses. In the near future, rental income from the commercial space is expected to pay annual bond amortization.

## Appendix Two

Northampton Downtown Survey

TIME: October 29-25, 1980

PLACE: Main Street, Northampton, MA.

Of People Interviewed:

- 44% got to Downtown by Car
- 7% got to Downtown by Bus

- 54% were shopping, eating (restaurant) or doing errands
  29% were visiting professional office or bank

- 64% expected to spend from 1/2 to 2 hours Downtown

- 78% list the Downtown as being Important to them

- 66% felt Downtown was Good concerning attractiveness
  54% felt Downtown was Good concerning cleanliness
  60% felt Downtown was Good concerning friendliness
  52% felt Downtown was Good concerning variety of goods
  62% felt Downtown was Good concerning quality of goods

*46% felt Downtown parking was Poor
 31% felt Downtown parking was Fair

### Downtown vs. Malls

- 92% felt attractiveness was Better or Same
- 72% felt variety of goods was Better or Same
- 98% felt quality of goods was Better or Same
- 73% felt parking was Worse

## Appendix Three

PROJECT FOR PUBLIC SPACES, INC.

NORTHAMPTON MERCHANTS SURVEY: November 15, 1980

1. Do you own or rent this location?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | RENT | (80.3) |
| 2 | OWN | (19.7) |

2. How long have you been in business at this location?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | UNDER ONE YEAR | (13.4) |
| 2 | ONE TO FOUR YEARS | (37.3) |
| 3 | FIVE TO NINE YEARS | (19.4) |
| 4 | TEN TO FIFTEEN YEARS | ( 7.5) |
| 5 | OVER FIFTEEN YEARS | (22.4) |

3. What is your busiest day of the week?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | MONDAY | ( 4.6) |
| 2 | TUESDAY | ( 4.6) |
| 3 | WEDNESDAY | ( 9.2) |
| 4 | THURSDAY | |
| 5 | FRIDAY | (20.0) |
| 6 | SATURDAY | (61.5) |
| 7 | SUNDAY | |

4. What is your busiest time <u>that</u> day?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EARLY MORNING | ( 4.6) |
| 2 | LATE MORNING | (13.8) |
| 3 | LUNCH TIME | (18.5) |
| 4 | EARLY AFTERNOON | (26.2) |
| 5 | LATE AFTERNOON | (27.7) |
| 6 | EVENING | ( 6.2) |
| 7 | OTHER | ( 3.1) |

5. Which best describes how frequently the <u>majority</u> of your clientele uses your business?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | DAILY | (4.5) |
| 2 | AT LEAST THREE OR FOUR TIMES A WEEK | (6.1) |
| 3 | ONE OR TWO TIMES A WEEK | (25.8) |
| 4 | TWO OR THREE TIMES A MONTH | (28.8) |
| 5 | ONCE A MONTH | (13.6) |
| 6 | LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH | (21.2) |

6. About how long does the <u>majority</u> of your clientele **stay** while doing business with you?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | LESS THAN FIVE MINUTES | (10.8) |
| 2 | FIVE TO FIFTEEN MINUTES | (35.4) |
| 3 | SIXTEEN TO THIRTY MINUTES | (40.0) |
| 4 | THIRTY-ONE TO SIXTY MINUTES | ( 6.2) |
| 5 | ONE TO TWO HOURS | ( 7.7) |
| 6 | MORE THAN TWO HOURS | |

7. Over the last five years, has your busines ...

   1 IMPROVED (65.5)
   2 DECLINED (12.7)
   3 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME (21.8)

8. If you had the opportunity to move out of Downtown, would you?

   1 YES (12.5)
   2 NO (87.5)

9. How would you rate the Downtown area for the following?

   a: Attractiveness of Downtown
   GOOD(56) FAIR(40) POOR(3) DON'T KNOW(-)

   b: Quality of eating places
   GOOD(65) FAIR(28) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

   c: Cleanliness of streets and sidewalks
   GOOD(27) FAIR(48) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

   d: Comfortable places to sit outside
   GOOD(16) FAIR(36) POOR(42) DON'T KNOW(-)

   e: Number of convenient parking spaces
   GOOD(9) FAIR(26) POOR(62) DON'T KNOW(-)

   f: Convenience of shopping hours
   GOOD(49) FAIR(40) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

   g: Friendliness of sales people
   GOOD(74) FAIR(20) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

   h: Safety during the evening
   GOOD(68) FAIR(21) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

   i: Number of events, festivals, and special downtown promotions
   GOOD(37) FAIR(38) POOR(17) DON'T KNOW(-)

   j: Variety of goods sold
   GOOD(67) FAIR(26) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

   k: Cost of goods sold
   GOOD(42) FAIR(45) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

   l: Quality of goods sold
   GOOD(78) FAIR(18) POOR(-) DON'T KNOW(-)

10. What is the most important way that you promote your store and attract customers?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENTS | (21.2) |
| 2 | RADIO ADVERTISEMENTS | (10.6) |
| 3 | GROUP PROMOTIONS | (16.7) |
| 4 | WINDOW DISPLAYS | (40.9) |
| 5 | WORD-OF-MOUTH | (10.6) |
| 6 | OTHER | |

11. How frequently do you change your windown displays?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | MORE THAN ONCE A MONTH | (22.6) |
| 2 | ABOUT ONCE A MONTH | (27.4) |
| 3 | ABOUT EVERY TWO MONTHS | (16.1) |
| 4 | ABOUT EVERY TWO TO FIVE MONTHS | ( 1.6) |
| 5 | ABOUT EVERY SIX MONTHS | ( 4.8) |
| 6 | ABOUT EVERY SEVEN MONTHS TO ONCE A YEAR | ( 8.1) |
| 7 | NEVER | (19.4) |
| 8 | OTHER | ( - ) |

## Appendix Four

### Key Parking References

1. American Society of Civil Engineers, Urban Planning Guide, (New York, 1969).

2. N.S. Kenig and R.J. Boylan, "Toward Realistic Parking Standards", Traffic Engineering, October, 1971.

3. Parking Consultants Council, National Parking Association, The Dimensions of Parking. Washington, Urban Land Institute and National Parking Association, 1979.

4. U.S. Department of Transportation, Study of Parking Management Tactics, Vo. 2: Overview and Case Studies, (Washington, D.C., 1980).

## Appendix Five

### City of Northampton Parking Ticket Revenues

1. Fiscal 77'

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | $ anticipated | - | $ 47,120 |
| Total | $ paid | - | 18,670 |
| % | $ not paid | - | 60% |

2. Fiscal 78'

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | $ anticipated | - | $ 43,001 |
| Total | $ paid | - | 14,882 |
| % | $ not paid | - | 65% |

3. Fiscal 79'

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | $ anticipated | - | $ 74,618 |
| Total | $ paid | - | 26,672 |
| % | $ not paid | - | 64% |

N. -- meter revenues

1. 1977

Masonic Lot - $ 3,838.45 Total estimate revenue
$ 81.67/meter/year

Strong Lot - $ 5,447.25 Total estimate revenue
$ 81.30/meter/year

Main Street - $ 8,499.00 Total estimate revenue
$ 69.66/meter/year

TOTAL: $ $\frac{62,786.16}{800 \text{ meters}}$ = $ 78.48 per meter, per year

2. 1980

Masonic Lot - $ 2,936.50 Total estimate revenue
$ 62.48/meter/year

Strong Lot - $ 3,118.00 Total estimate revenue
$ 46.54/meter/year

Main Street - $ 6,884.00 Total estimate revenue
$ 56.43/meter/year

TOTAL: $ $\frac{61,745.00}{800 \text{ meters}}$ = $ 77.18 per meter, per year